

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 10-13, and 15-16 have been amended. New claims 17-25 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-6 and 8-25 are pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arataki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,774,434, (hereafter "Arataki") in view of Dimitri et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,574,424 (hereafter "Dimitri").

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,742,147 (hereafter "Sasaki") in view of Dimitri, and further in view of Uesaka et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,044,157 (hereafter "Uesaka").

Discussion of the Invention

Under the invention, a recording medium includes a recording-limited area provided in the recording medium, which is recognized as an area in which recording is limited. The recording limit is able to be canceled so that recording of information in said recording-limited area can be performed. Additionally, information about the position of the recording-limited area may be in an encrypted form.

Combination of Arataki and Dimitri Does Not Teach the Claimed Invention

Arataki teaches recording and deleting data from a recording medium, and further teaches that overwriting data in a region with pre-recorded information is allowed. Arataki provides no disclosure about creating a recording limit on a recording medium for providing an area that is recognized as a recording-limited area. Further, Arataki does not teach or suggest canceling the recording limit on the recording-limited area so that new information can be recorded there. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to point out with particularity any portion of Arataki that teaches these limitations of Applicants' claimed invention, and after careful review of Arataki, Applicants have been unable to locate any such teaching in Arataki.

Additionally, Dimitri fails to make up for the shortcomings of Arataki in this regard. Dimitri teaches a read-only medium which contains pre-recorded information, and which, once recorded to, cannot have new information recorded thereon. Accordingly, Dimitri does not teach or suggest canceling a recording limit for a recording-limited area, and then recording new information to the recording-limited area, as set forth in independent claims 1, 11, and 13. Thus, claims 1, 11 and 13 are patentable over the combination of Arataki and Dimitri since neither reference teaches or suggests canceling a recording limit for a recording-limited area on a recording medium, and then recording new information to the recording-limited area.

Further, the combination of Arataki and Dimitri does not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 2, 3, 10 and 14, wherein the recording limit is provided by

rendering it impossible to read-out allocation information for the recording-limited area.

After a thorough review of these references, Applicants were unable to locate any discussion in either of these references regarding allocation information or creating a recording-limited area in a recording medium by manipulating the reading of allocation information. Thus, neither Arataki, nor Dimitri, nor any of the other art of record teaches or suggests the subject matter of dependent claims 2, 3, 10 and 14.

Additionally, the combination of Arataki and Dimitri fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claims 4-6 and 8, including a step of issuing an instruction to record to said recording medium prior to canceling the recording limit, and a step of issuing an instruction for displaying predetermined information when the recording instruction has been issued. Arataki and Dimitri merely teach conventional display of recorded information, and teach nothing regarding displaying information in response to a recording instruction. Accordingly, claims 4-6 and 8 are patentable over the combination of Arataki and Dimitri.

Further, with respect to claim 9, Arataki and Dimitri fail to teach a recording limit that is canceled by rendering an ID error detection code that was formerly inconsistent to be consistent with a corresponding ID. Applicants were unable to locate any discussion in Arataki or Dimitri regarding creating or canceling a recording-limited area by manipulation of ID error detection codes. Accordingly, claim 9 is patentable over the combination Arataki and Dimitri.

In addition, with respect to new claims 17, 20 and 23, the combination of Arataki and Dimitri does not teach that the recording limit is provided by causing a portion of the recording medium to be recognized as defective, and then canceled by causing the portion to be no longer recognized as defective. Further, Sasaki, also fails to teach these claims. Sasaki teaches only defect area management, namely, identifying a defective area. Sasaki teaches nothing about creating an area in a medium that is recognized as defective, and subsequently canceling this. Thus, Sasaki fails to teach providing a recording limit by causing an area to be recognized as defective, and then canceling the recording limit by causing the area to be no longer recognized as defective, as recited in the claims. This is neither taught nor suggested by Sasaki or the other art of record taken singly, or in combination. Accordingly, new claims 17, 20 and 23 are patentable over the art of record.

Additionally, claim 11 was rejected over the combination of Sasaki, Dimitri and Uesaka. While claim 11 is patentable for the reasons discussed above, claim 11 is further patentable over the combination of Sasaki, Dimitri and Uesaka, since claim 11 includes the limitation that the information about the position of the recording-limited area is in an encrypted form, which is subsequently decrypted. While Uesaka teaches encrypting information in general, Uesaka provides no suggestion or motivation for encrypting information about the position of a recording-limited area on a recording medium. Sasaki and Dimitri also provide no teaching or suggestion for such a method.

Accordingly, claim 11 is patentable over the cited references and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination.

The remaining claims not discussed above include additional limitations also not taught or suggested by the combination of Arataki and Dimitri, or the other art of record, and are similarly patentable.

Interview

Applicants and their undersigned attorney would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the in-person interview conducted on June 8, 2006, wherein the invention was described to the Examiner in greater detail, and it was agreed that Applicants would amend the claims to attempt to better define their invention. Applicants believe that the claims presented with this amendment define patentable features of their invention not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Accordingly, allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/084,379
Amendment
Response to Office Action mailed February 24, 2006

H&A-108

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR
& BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By



Colin D. Barnitz
Reg. No. 35,061
(703) 684-1120

Date: July 21, 2006